Grand Bargain in 2020:

Annual Self Report – Narrative Summary

Name of Institution: International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Point of Contact (please provide a name, title and email to enable the consultants to contact you for an interview):
Tristan Burnett, Deputy Director of the Department of Operations and Emergencies; tburnett@iom.int

Date of Submission: 16 February 2021

(NB. Please limit your answer to no more than **5 pages in total** – anything over this word limit will not be considered by ODI in their analysis. Please respond to all of the questions below.)

Grand Bargain in 2020

Question 1: Reflecting on the information you have provided in the Excel spreadsheet, please highlight the 2 or 3 key outcomes or results relating to the Grand Bargain that your institution achieved in 2020?

In 2020, the IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM) role in supporting the improvement of overall quality of HNOs/HRPs throughout the year has been strengthened and data continued to be frequently shared with humanitarian actors to inform their responses. In particular, the number of HNOs developed in total grew from 21 in 2019 to 25 in 2020. Out of the total, IOM contributed to 20 (80%) in 2020. In comparison, IOM's DTM contributed to 17 in 2019 and to 13 in 2018, thereby informing the analysis on internal displacement for an increasing number of HNOs over the years. In all 23 countries where IOM's DTM was active in 2020, it can also be observed that DTM is an important contributor throughout the HPC, including response monitoring. Notably, 69 per cent of the 2020 HNOs and HRPs received a high score rating, attributed by an interagency team utilizing the new scoring criteria established by the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) Steering Group, in collaboration with members of the Grand Bargain Workstream on Needs Assessments (Workstream 5). These figures show increasing utility and value of DTM data to inform humanitarian planning and response and support overall quality of needs assessment over the years.

Further increasing its efforts to support localization, IOM strengthened its engagement with local and national NGOs, as the COVID-19 response has proven that localization is both a necessity and an opportunity for effectively meeting humanitarian needs. As part of IOM localization efforts in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, IOM has received a multi-country allocation of USD 25M from CERF that was channelled to NGOs at a country level and supports NGOs in Bangladesh, the Central African Republic, Haiti, Libya, South Sudan and Sudan to effectively respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. Over one third of the NGOs benefitting from this grant are local organizations, in line with the core commitments of the Grand Bargain. In addition, in the past year, IOM initiated pilots in three countries to localize the CCCM framework and support national authorities and local actors to lead displacement responses. The pilots are based off of assessments conducted in Bangladesh, Ethiopia and Indonesia on barriers to localization and needs of stakeholders.

Question 2: How has your institution contributed to the advancement of gender equality and women's empowerment [1] in humanitarian settings through its implementation of the Grand Bargain? What results/outcomes have been achieved in this regard? (please outline specific initiatives or changes in practice and their outcomes/results). Please refer to the Guidelines for definitions of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, which are included in this self-report template package.
In addition to advocacy for the inclusion of Sex and Age Disaggregated Data (SADD) to support production of data and analysis specific to women, girls, boys

---

[1] Refer to the IASC definitions of gender equality and women empowerment, available here.

and men, in 2020 IOM continued to work closely with the Protection Cluster, the GBV AoR, the CP AoR, and other partners to better mainstream GBV risk mitigation and greater participation of women and girls in data collection activities. In particular, IOM maintained coordination and work in support of the collection and analysis of SAAD through relevant workstreams, including the launch of the DTM and Protection Webinar Series consisting of seven different webinars throughout June and July 2020, each featuring a thematic aspect of protection related workstreams and best practices. Notably, the webinar facilitated on July 2020 was done in coordination with the GBV AoR and GBV Information Management (IM) experts. As a result, participants developed better understanding of how data can be used to inform GBV mitigation and risk assessment.

Question 3: How has the humanitarian-development nexus been strategically mainstreamed in your institutional implementation of the Grand Bargain commitments? Please explain how your institution has linked commitments 10.1 - 10.5 with other commitments from other workstreams.

IOM has been working to better articulate and further operationalize the HDN. Through its broad mandate and extensive operational footprint, IOM has continued to engage across the humanitarian, development and peace nexus (HDPN), working both in sudden onset and protracted crisis and displacement scenarios. IDPs make up the biggest share of IOM crisis related beneficiaries, from emergency response through longer-term approaches to prevent and respond to the drivers and long-term impact of displacement. In 2020, IOM issued 41 Crisis Response plans, targeting over 35.8 million people with programming across the crisis spectrum and ensuring nexus approaches to foster crisis recovery and resilience. Out of those, 8 country operations developed multi-year crisis response plans, building on multi-year and country specific analysis. The COVID-19 crisis has also demonstrated a push toward the implementation of integrated approaches, to address socio-economic recovery needs, as well as strengthen health systems.

IOM has dedicated staff capacities to promote adaptive approaches and enhance country and regional offices' capacities around the HDPN and crisis responses. The development of HDPN Guidance tools and training was initiated in 2020 to ensure complementarities in both programming elements for optimal outcomes on the ground. IOM's Institutional Migration Crisis Operational Framework (adopted by its Council in 2012) – a pragmatic and flexible tool for crisis response - is now in the process of being reviewed alongside the new developments and to reflect IOM's proactive engagement within the nexus. At headquarter level, strategic efforts included the revisions of the IOM division strategies to systematize the incorporation of the triple nexus as a core cross-cutting approach. A Senior Nexus Adviser, based in IOM Headquarters, has been recruited and works across IOM's departments to provide guidance, facilitate dialogue and foster knowledge management to further enhance the operationalization throughout the organization. Through adhering to the OECD-DAC Recommendations, in 2020, IOM also strengthen its work within the UN Reform, including partnerships with other relevant agencies.

IOM has taken the lead in several countries in fostering planning to facilitate more effective responses in support of durable solutions, such as in Ethiopia, Iraq, Mozambique, and Sudan, through the establishment of durable solutions working groups and coordination forums. In this regard, IOM's DTM continued to be one the key providers of information monitoring populations throughout their displacement to situations of return or voluntary relocation, including in the provision of joint analysis across the nexus and working towards strengthening evidence-based response to achieve collective outcomes for both humanitarian and development programming in the field. IOM continued to work across thematic areas to better understand how data can further support development and peace actors to better address underlying vulnerabilities and root causes of humanitarian needs over a multi‑year horizon. As a result, extensive partnerships were created in several countries, working across the nexus, including but not limited to Ethiopia, Mozambique, Lebanon, Sudan, Nigeria, South-Sudan ‑as well as increased mainstreaming of preparedness and disaster risk management.

Grand Bargain 2016-2020: Overall achievements and remaining gaps

Question 4: What are the 2-3 key achievements/areas of most progress by your institution since 2016? Please report on your institutional progress for the period 2016-2020, **even** if your institution did not become a signatory until after 2016.

Over the years, DTM's key achievements include initiatives, partnerships, and workstreams related to Question 1: to support the improvement of the quality of HNOs/HRPs; champion the better use of data and analysis; and strengthen advancements in data science, ethics and data responsibility. The latter workstream was further reflected in DTM's support in 2017 to the "signal code" effort led by the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative to enhance standards and ethics in the use of data for humanitarian response.[2]

In terms of Cash-Based programming, IOM focused on internal operationalisation and capacity building throughout the last five years to more efficiently deliver context-sensitive Cash-Based Interventions (CBI). Although CBI programming was not new to IOM, the Organization has sought to develop standardised guidance and documentation as to operationalize and manage CBI programming. In particular, IOM has taken significant action to review internal financial and administrative systems and procedures against the requirements of CBIs to ensure better implementation, recording and reporting of the modality. Tools, guidance and training materials have been developed, piloted and rolled-out in several countries, fostering more systematic use of CBI in humanitarian programming. As a result, IOM highly increased the number of countries and people assisted through CBI interventions for the past 5 years.

---

[2] Full publication by Harvard Humanitarian Initiative: "The Signal Code: A Human Rights Approach to Information During Crisis."

Question 5: What, in your institutional view, have been the main achievements of the Grand Bargain signatories, <u>as a collective</u>, since 2016? Please indicate specific commitments, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think most progress has been made collectively by signatories.

Since 2016, the work under WS5 has enable multiple key partners to work together and produce key outputs. These outputs, and the collaborative work taken in producing those, for the past few years, have not only increased synergy and coherence but also fostered more collaboration between actors involved in needs assessment and analysis both at the global level and in the field. IOM has strengthened its initiative in collaboration with partners to further discussions and coordinated strategies to strengthening the ethical and responsible use of data. IOM co-leads the Interagency Standing Committee (IASC) Results Group (RG1) subgroup on data responsibility with OCHA and UNHCR to develop a joint system-wide operational guidance on data responsibility framework for humanitarian response. In addition, IOM continued its leading role in the Data Science and Ethics Group (DSEG), which gathers key actors involved in data science and ethics to address the juncture between principles and practice. In 2020, IOM, together with OCHA, WHO, and UNHCR, co-lead the Global Information Management and Assessment Cell (GIMAC) to support joint analysis for the COVID-19 Global Humanitarian Response Plan (GHRP). Furthermore, IOM supported WHO for the collection of additional indicators through the DTM Multi-Sectoral Needs Assessment (MSNA) to support public health and humanitarian response at the country level in relation to the impact of the pandemic. Together with WFP, IOM did <u>a joint analysis exercise on food security, migration, and displacement</u> in the context of the pandemic, which was released in November 2020.[3]

As a result of the COVID-19 crisis, in the last year, IOM, together with other UN organizations and NGO partners, has been extensively working to ensure harmonization and consistency when it comes to local and national partner arrangements, including higher budget flexibility between the NGO partner's budget headings, reprogramming funds depending on how the situation evolves, simplifying documentation for payments, etc. This includes encouraging donors to show flexibility, which IOM and other agencies can then flow down to partners. Many of the ongoing initiatives and measures are now supporting local partners to respond effectively to current humanitarian and additional COVID-19-related needs, which stem from existing Grand Bargain commitments and are further promoted and carried forward through the IASC.

---

[3] Joint publication by International Organization for Migration (IOM) and World Food Programme (WFP): Populations at Risk: Implications of COVID-19 for Hunger, Migration and Displacement, November 2020.

Question 6: What has the Grand Bargain <u>not been able to achieve</u> in its five year tenure? What outstanding obstacles, gaps, areas of weakness still remain after five years, in terms of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian action? Please indicate specific commitments, thematic or cross-cutting issues or workstreams where you think there remain key gaps or obstacles.

IOM believes that a strategic focus may have been more beneficial for the full achievement of some commitments. The relationship of some of the workstreams with IASC Result Groups and with other fora has not always been clear and a narrower result orientation could have strengthened efficiency and effectiveness. While IOM has witnessed a considerable expansion across all aspects of its programming, financial resources channelled to IOM remain largely earmarked or softly earmarked and with detailed conditionalities, making it challenging to cascade flexible funding to national/international organizations as well as more efficient programming and flexible planning. The small amount of flexible funding received over the 5-year tenure has inhibited IOM's capacity to respond to humanitarian crises.

Risk and the Grand Bargain

Question 7a: How has risk (financial, operational, reputational, etc) affected your institution's implementation of the core commitments since you became a signatory to the Grand Bargain?

In recognition to IOM's partners' participation and contribution to its work, and in view of the COVID-19 pandemic, the organization considers it essential to ensure that existing partnerships are strengthened, and new partnerships are developed. As such, IOM has been working towards identifying more avenues for ensuring swifter, simplified and flexible arrangements so that NGO partners may continue working on joint initiatives to pursue effective access and delivery to intended beneficiaries. However, despite active consultations with Member States and donors, most of the current funding that IOM receives is strictly earmarked and includes detailed conditionalities, making it very difficult to pass any flexibility down to implementing partners and the implementation of core commitments.

Question 7b: How has your institution sought to mitigate or address these risks to enable implementation of the core commitments.

Together with IASC partners, IOM has been engaging with donors, including the Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative, on questions of humanitarian financing. Quality and flexible funding has proven to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of humanitarian responses in the context of COVID-19, and it enables principled, accountable, and needs-based humanitarian action. In the COVID19 response, it has helped mobilize front-line local actors to deliver assistance more rapidly. IOM continues to advocate for the conversion of the flexibility measures into standard practice beyond June 2021 and irrespective of the COVID-19 context.